DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Centerville School District

Accountability Review - Focus Monitoring Report 2007-2008

Team Members: Rita Pettigrew, Susan Sletto, and Donna Huber; Education Specialists

Dates of On Site Visit: January 9 and 10, 2008

Date of Report: February 5, 2008 3 month update due: May 5, 2008 6 month update due: August 5, 2008 9 month update due: November 5, 2008

Program monitoring and evaluation.

In conjunction with its general supervisory responsibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Special Education Programs (SEP) of the Office of Educational Services and Support shall monitor agencies, institutions, and organizations responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state, including any obligations imposed on those agencies, institutions, and organizations. The department shall ensure:

- (1) That the requirements of this article are carried out;
- (2) That each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the state, including each program administered by any other state or local agency, but not including elementary schools and secondary schools for Indian children operated or funded by the Secretary of the Interior:
- (a) Is under the general supervision of the persons responsible for educational programs for children with disabilities in the department; and
- (b) Meets the educational standards of the state education agency, including the requirements of this article; and
- (3) In carrying out this article with respect to homeless children, the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, are met. (Reference- ARSD 24:05:20:18.)

State monitoring--Quantifiable indicators and priority areas.

The department shall monitor school districts using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as are needed to adequately measure performance in those areas:

- (1) Provision of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment;
- (2) Department exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services as defined in this article and article 24:14; and
- (3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:18:02.)

State enforcement -- Determinations.

On an annual basis, based on local district performance data, information obtained through monitoring visits, and other information available, the department shall determine whether each school district meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA...

Based upon the information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available, Special Education Programs of the Office of Educational Services and Support determines if the agency, institution, or organization responsible for carrying out special education programs in the state:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Act;
- Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act'

- Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act; or
- Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act. (Reference-ARSD 24:05:20:23.04.)

Deficiency correction procedures.

The department shall require local education agencies to correct deficiencies in program operations that are identified through monitoring as soon as possible, but not later than one year from written identification of the deficiency. The department shall order agencies to take corrective actions and to submit a plan for achieving and documenting full compliance. (Reference-ARAD 24:05:20:20.)

1. FAPE in the LRE - Performance Indicator

State Performance Plan - Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.

- 1. Percent of districts meeting State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- 2. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with not accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grad level standar4ds; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- 3. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

Annual Performance Report Activity – Conduct an accommodation study to verify IEP teams are providing instructional accommodations if they are also providing those accommodation on statewide assessments.

Follow-up date: January 9 and 10, 2008

Finding:

Through a review of 18 student files, data gathered by the review team indicated the following:

- 1. The accommodations/modifications were appropriate for the skill areas affected by the disability in 18 of the 18 files reviewed.
- 2. The accommodations/modification provided for State/District wide assessments were provided in the student's instructional program in 15 of the 18 files reviewed.
- 3. The accommodations identified in the IEPs for State/District wide assessment were used during the assessment administration in 9 of 18 files reviewed.

Corrective Action:

Corrective Action: Document the specific activities	Timeline for	Person(s)	(SEP Use
and procedures that will be implemented and the	Completion	Responsible	Only)
data/criteria that will be used to verify compliance.			Date Met
Activity/Procedure:			
1. The district will review current policy/procedure to	Activity #	District	
determine why discrepancies are occurring.	1&2	Administration	
	Within 1	&	
2. Develop a process that will allow for the	week of	District Staff	
appropriate documentation and provision of	receiving		
accommodations for state/district assessments.	report		
3. Train IEP staff and testing coordinator in the			
procedures/process.			

	Activity #3	
	By February 15, 2008	
4. Implement procedures and collect data to verify	13, 2006	
accommodation are appropriately documented and	Activity #4	
provided during state/district assessments.	By 6 month	
	progress	
	report due	
	date.	
5. Analyze data collected to determine if procedures		
corrected discrepancy. Repeat steps 1 through 5 if	A - 1: .: 1: // [
discrepancies continue.	Activity #5 By 6 month	
	progress	
	report due	
	date.	
Progress Report data to be submitted to SEP:		
Written description of the districts review process		
to identify why the discrepancies are occurring.		
 Written description of the process the district will 		
implement to correct the discrepancies.		
3. Training documentation to include the date staff		
training occurred, name of individual who provided		
the training and sign-in sheet with the name of all		
participants/position titles, who attended the		
•		
training.		
training. 4. Following the 2008 assessment window, the		
training. 4. Following the 2008 assessment window, the district will review 3 student IEPs from each grade		
training. 4. Following the 2008 assessment window, the		
training. 4. Following the 2008 assessment window, the district will review 3 student IEPs from each grade level taking the Dakota Step. The district will use		

3 month Progress Report:6 month Progress Report:9 month Progress Report:

SEP.

summary of the data results will be submitted to

Spot Checks

Ctudant Nama	Disability
Student Name	Disability

Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:	Skill Area:
Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.	Daily Mod./Acc.
0/0 4	0/5 4	0/0 4	0 / 0 4	0/0 4
S/D Assess Acc.	S/D Assess Acc.	S/D Assess Acc.	S/D Assess Acc.	S/D Assess Acc.
As per IEP	As per IEP	As per IEP	As per IEP	As per IEP
Accommodations	Accommodations	Accompandations	A a a a mana a dation a	Accompandations
Accommodations	Accommodations	Accommodations	Accommodations	Accommodations
used during S/D	used during S/D	used during S/D	used during S/D	used during S/D
Assessment	Assessment	Assessment	Assessment	Assessment

	1.	Accommodations	appropriate '	for Disability? \	∕es No
--	----	----------------	---------------	-------------------	--------

- 2. Accommodations used during State testing were used in student's instructional program? Yes No
- 3. Accommodations listed on IEP for state testing were actually used. Yes No

Student Name	Disability
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

| Skill Area: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Daily Mod./Acc. |
C/D Assess Ass	S/D Access Acc	S/D Assess Ass	C/D Assess Ass	C/D Access Acc
S/D Assess Acc.	S/D Assess Acc.	S/D Assess Acc	S/D Assess Acc	S/D Assess Acc
As per IEP				
Accommodations	Accommodations	Accommodations	Accommodations	Accommodations
used during				
S/Assessment	S/Assessment	S/Assessment	S/Assessment	S/Assessment
				2.1.20000

- Accommodations appropriate for Disability? Yes No
 Accommodations used during State testing were used in student's instructional program? Yes No
- 3. Accommodations listed on IEP for state testing were actually used. Yes